

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No. 020431.1026

In re Application of:

CHETHAN GORUR, ET AL.

Serial No. **09/978,277**

Filed: 15 OCTOBER 2001

For: **CUSTOMIZABLE STATE MACHINE
AND STATE AGGREGATION
TECHNIQUE FOR PROCESSING
COLLABORATIVE AND
TRANSACTIONAL BUSINESS
OBJECTS**

~~~~~

Examiner:

**MATTHEW S. MEYERS**

Art Unit: 3629

Confirmation No.: **4651**

## RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir/Madam:

This response is submitted in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed 18 October 2007, which provides for a one-month response period ending Monday, 19 November 2007, since 18 November 2007 is a Sunday. Please consider the following election and remarks.

## **ELECTION:**

The Restriction Requirement alleges that a restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Claims 1-30, drawn to a method, software and computer-implemented state machine for processing business objects representing collaborations between business entities, classified in class 705, subclass 01.
- II. Claim 31, drawn to a computer-implemented state machine for processing business objects representing collaborations between business entities, classified in class 705, subclass 01.
- III. Claims 32-30, drawn to a method, software and computer implemented state aggregator for aggregating state information associated with a composite business object, the composite business object representing at least one collaboration between a plurality of business entities, classified in class 705, subclass 01.

The Applicants elect, with traverse, to pursue Group I. Group I is directed to a method, software and computer-implemented state machine for processing business objects representing collaborations between business entities. The Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing election is not acquiescence in the propriety of the restriction or in the accuracy in the determination and/or identification of the alleged “unrelated inventions” in the subject Application. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement as set forth below, as the Requirement is improper.

The Applicants elect, with traverse to pursue Claims 1-30 (which are directed to a single species). The Applicants reiterate that the foregoing election is not an acquiescence in the propriety of the restriction or in the accuracy in the determination and/or identification of an alleged “species” in the subject Application. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement as set forth below, as the Requirement is improper.